

REMARKS

In the present application, 21 claims were examined and rejected. In response, Applicants are submitting the following remarks. In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

Double Patenting Rejection

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 1 - 21 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,613,968 (the '968 Patent). Applicants are concurrently filing a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). As such, the statutory type double patenting rejection of claims 1 - 21 should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 14, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chang* (U.S. Patent No. 6,118,057) in view of *Pollock* (U.S. Patent No. 5,271,307). However, the Office Action Summary states that claims 1-21 are rejected. For the purpose of responding to the Office Action, Applicants will assume that all claims stand rejected. Specifically, Examiner asserts that *Chang* discloses all of the elements of the claims except for the use of a setscrew hole in each end of the base piece. However, Examiner states that *Pollock* discloses the use of a guitar bridge assembly with a setscrew hole in each end of the base piece. Applicants respectfully traverse.

A review of the disclosure of *Chang* does not provide "a vertical alignment hole *at each end* of said base piece" as required in Applicants' independent claims (emphasis added). Because no reference is made as to which element of *Chang* constitutes the base piece, Applicants will assume the base piece is the bridge body 10. As clearly shown in Figure 3 of *Chang*, the bridge body consists of one through hole 14 formed on an extension plate 15 of the bridge body. However, no through hole is formed on the opposite side of the bridge body. Even if one is to assume that countersunk holes 16 are

equivalent to Applicants' vertical alignment holes, these countersunk holes are not located at each end of the bridge body. As such, the element of "a vertical alignment hole at each end of said base piece" is not disclosed or taught in *Chang*.

Additionally as Examiner stated in the Office Action, "Chang does not disclose the use of a setscrew hole in each end of the base piece being formed from an outer vertical edge to each vertical alignment hole (see figure 11)." Applicants assume the statement to "see figure 11" is in reference to *Pollock* as *Chang* does not include a Figure 11.

Figure 11 of *Pollock* shows an exploded view of the guitar bridge assembly, which consists of three separate pieces: a first base body 15, an anchor plate 20, and a second base body 25. Examiner did not indicate which element is equivalent to Applicants' base piece or setscrew hole. Assuming Examiner is equating the setscrew hole with the plurality of string mounting apertures 30, these apertures do not function as setscrew holes "being formed from an outer vertical edge to each vertical alignment hole." Instead these apertures are formed completely through the anchor plate, do not intersect a vertical alignment hole at each end, and are formed to receive strings (not setscrews).

Alternatively, if Applicants are to assume the Examiner is equating the fastener apertures 19 to Applicants' setscrew holes, these apertures also do not function as a setscrew hole "being formed from an outer vertical edge to each vertical alignment hole." These apertures are formed completely through the first base body and do not intersect a vertical alignment hole at each end. As such, *Pollock* does not provide the element Examiner asserts is missing from *Chang*.

Even if it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify *Chang* by *Pollock*, one would not obtain the present invention. Therefore, claims 1-21 are not obvious in view of the cited prior art. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants request that the Examiner particularly point out the elements of the prior art that render the claims of the present invention obvious.

Based on these remarks, Applicants believe the Office Action of June 28, 2004 has been responded to in full, and that claims 1-21 are allowable. If Examiner has any questions regarding the case, Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
Sharon C. Devereaux et al.

Date: 9/28/04

By: *Susan Yee*
Susan Yee
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 95054
Phone: (650) 812-3400
Fax: (650) 812-3444